

PETER M. HART, Esq. (State Bar No. 198691)
LAW OFFICES OF PETER M. HART
13952 Bora Bora Way, F-320
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292
Telephone: (310) 478-5789
Facsimile: (509) 561-6441
hartpeter@msn.com

KENNETH H. YOON (State Bar No. 198443)
LAW OFFICES OF KENNETH H. YOON
One Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2200
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 612-0988
(213) 947-1211 facsimile
kyoon@yoon-law.com

LARRY W. LEE (State Bar No. 228175)
DIVERISTY LAW GROUP, A Professional Corporation
444 S. Flower Street, Suite 1370
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 488 – 6555
(213) 488 – 6554 facsimile
lwlee@diversitylaw.com

Attorneys for Shameika Moody

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHAMEIKA MOODY as an individual and on
behalf all of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,
vs.

CHARMING SHOPPES OF DELAWARE,
INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: C 07-06073 MHP

**DECLARATION OF LARRY W. LEE IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION
TO DEFENDANT CHARMING SHOPPES,
INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK
OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION PURSUANT
TO F.R.C.P. RULE 12(B)(2)**

**JUDGE: HON. MARILYN HALL PATEL
DATE: MAY 5, 2008
TIME: 2:00 P.M.
COURTROOM: 15**

DECLARATION OF LARRY W. LEE

I, LARRY W. LEE, declare as follows:

1. I am an individual over the age of 18. I am a California bar-admitted attorney with a private practice. My firm is the Diversity Law Group, P.C. and I am one of the attorneys of record for Plaintiff Shameika Moody. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below and if called to testify I could and would do so competently.

2. In a prior motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction brought by co-Defendant Charming Shoppes of Delaware, Inc. ("CSDI"), it was represented to this Court in both signed declarations and oral arguments, that CSDI was a payroll service (like ADP) for Lane Bryant and the other divisions within Charming Shoppes, Inc. ("CSI").

3. Subsequent to this Court's denial of CSDI's prior Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiff has discovered that ADP was in fact, the actual payroll company used to process Plaintiff's payroll, not CSDI. Attached hereto as Exhibit "1" are true and correct samples of Plaintiff's pay stubs, which clearly show that it was processed by ADP, and not CSDI (Plaintiff's social security number and address have been redacted for purposes of privacy).

4. As such, CSDI could not have been a "payroll" service as it claimed, due to the fact that ADP was the actual payroll service being used.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on this 11th day of April 2008.

_____/s/_____
Larry W. Lee